

REMARKS

Claims 1-21 are pending in the present application. The Examiner has previously acknowledged Applicants' election of claims 9, 10, 12, 13 and 15, while claims 1-8, 11, 14 and 16-21 are withdrawn. Claims 9, 10, 12, 13 and 15 have been rejected. Claims 9, and 15 have been amended. Claims 22-25 are new. Claims 9, 10, 12, 13, 15 and 22-25 remain for consideration upon entry of the present response. Support for the amendments may be found at least in FIG. 9 and pages 1 and 19-20 of the specification as originally filed. No new matter has been added. Applicants respectfully request consideration and allowance of the claims.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 9, 10, 12, 13 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Uehara et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,659,376, hereinafter "Uehara") in view of Yamanaka (JP 9-022000A, hereinafter, "Yamanaka"). The Examiner states that Uehara discloses all of the elements of the abovementioned claims, primarily in FIG. 12 and column 10, lines 16-17, except the particle interceptor having at least one recess directly formed therein, which the Examiner is disclosed in Yamanaka primarily in FIG. 7. Applicants respectfully traverse for at least the reason stated below.

The Examiner equates the first supporting member frame portion claimed as elements 150 and 154 combined in Uehara. The Examiner equates the second supporting member frame portion claimed as element 152 in Uehara. However, Uehara discloses that elements 152 and 150 are connected via an elastic member 154. Therefore, the Examiner relies on three separate elements of Uehara (i.e., elements 150, 154 and 152) to read on the two elements claimed in the present application. Uehara discloses that the fixing plate-supporting member 152 and the fixing plate 150 are spaced from each other with a certain gap which is filled with an elastic member 154 so that the fixing plate 150

is hanged in space by the fixing plate-supporting member 152 via the elastic member 154. (Col. 10, lines 29-33.)

Uehara does not disclose, teach or suggest “the second supporting member frame portion being vertically extended directly from the first supporting member frame portion” as recited in amended independent claims 9 and 15.

Lastly, FIG. 12 of Uehara discloses a large gap between the fixing plate support member (i.e., second frame supporting member frame portion) 152 and a side face of the liquid crystal panel 101. Thus, element 152 does not fix the liquid crystal display panel and block substantial translation of the liquid crystal display panel in the horizontal direction substantially normal to the vertical extension of the second supporting member frame portion.

In addition, FIG. 12 of Uehara discloses the rubber adhesive 151 in contact with the bottom portion 101b and an elastic member 161 in contact with a top portion 101a of the liquid crystal panel 101 to fix the liquid crystal panel 101. Uehara does not disclose, teach or suggest “the second supporting member frame portion **fixing** the liquid crystal display panel” as recited in independent claim 9 and 15.

More specifically, neither Uehara, nor Yamanaka, either alone or in combination, teach or suggest the second supporting member frame portion being vertically extended directly from the first supporting member frame portion, a side face of the liquid crystal display panel that is to be mounted on the liquid crystal display panel supporting member facing an inner side face of the second supporting member frame portion, the second supporting member frame portion fixing the liquid crystal display panel and substantially blocks translation of the liquid crystal display panel in a horizontal direction substantially normal to the vertical extension of the second supporting member frame portion, as recited in amended independent claim 9 and similarly recited in amended independent claim 15.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 9 and 15, including claims depending therefrom, i.e., claims 10, 12 and 13, define over Uehara in view of Yamanaka.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection to claims 9, 10, 12, 13 and 15 under § 102 be withdrawn.

Claims 9, 10, 13 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Niibori et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,808,707, hereinafter “Niibori”) in view of Yamanaka (JP 9-022000A, hereinafter, “Yamanaka”). The Examiner states that Niibori discloses all of the elements of the abovementioned claims, primarily in column 13, lines 21-32 and column 15, lines 45-46, except the particle interceptor having at least one recess directly formed therein, which the Examiner is disclosed in Yamanaka primarily in FIG. 7. Applicants respectfully traverse for at least the reason stated below.

The Examiner equates the first supporting member frame portion claimed as elements 17 and opening 19a combined in Niibori. The Examiner equates the second supporting member frame portion claimed as the vertically extended portion of element 17 in Niibori. However, the vertical extension of element 17 of Niibori merely allows the liquid crystal display panel 1 to rest thereon.

In particular, FIG. 19 of Niibori discloses the liquid crystal panel 1 resting on the vertical extension or second supporting member of the frame portion 17 and does not disclose that the side face of the liquid crystal display panel facing the inner side face of the second supporting member frame portion to block translation thereof, as claimed in claims 9 and 15. In addition, FIG. 19 of Niibori discloses the rubber adhesive 8 in contact with the bottom portion of the LC panel 1 and an elastic member 11 in contact with a top portion of the liquid crystal panel 1 to fix the liquid crystal panel 1.

Neither Niibori nor Yamanaka, either alone or in combination, disclose, teach or suggest “a side face of the liquid crystal display panel that is to be mounted on the

liquid crystal display panel supporting member facing an inner side face of the second supporting member frame portion, the second supporting member frame portion fixing the liquid crystal display panel and substantially blocks translation of the liquid crystal display panel in a horizontal direction substantially normal to the vertical extension of the second supporting member frame portion, as recited in amended independent claim 9 and similarly recited in amended independent claim 15.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 9 and 15, including claims depending therefrom, i.e., claims 10, 12 and 13, define over Niibori in view of Yamanaka.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection to claims 9, 10, 13 and 15 under § 102 be withdrawn.

New Claims

New claims 22-25 have been added to more particularly point out and distinctly claim over Uchura, Niibori and Yamanaka.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the instant application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this application be allowed and a Notice of Allowance issued. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicants' attorneys would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is cordially requested to telephone the undersigned.

In the event the Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks deems additional fees to be due in connection with this application, Applicants' attorney hereby authorizes that such fee be charged to Deposit Account No. 06-1130.

Respectfully submitted,

CANTOR COLBURN LLP

By /James J. Merrick/
James J. Merrick
Reg. No. 43,801
Confirmation No. 7126
Cantor Colburn LLP
20 Church Street, 22nd Floor
Hartford, CT 06103
PTO Customer No. 23413
Telephone: (860) 286-2929
Fax: (860) 286-0115

Date: October 15, 2008